DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 520 TM 001 440

AUTHOR	Brooks, Glenwood C., Jr.; Sedlacek William E.
TITLE	Choice of Racial Referent as a Variable in Racial Attitude Measurement.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Univ., College Park. Cultural Study Center.
REPORT NO	RR-5-71
PUB DATE	[71]
NOTE	22p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Attitude Tests; Caucasians; College Students; Factor Analysis; *Measurement Instruments; Negroes; *Racial Attitudes; *Situational Tests; Social Attitudes; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	SAS; *Situational Attitude Scale

ABSTRACT

The same Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) social and personal situations and items used in Sedlacek and Brooks' (1970a,b) study were used in the current study. Four forms, neutral (A1), black (B1), white (A2) and Negro (B2) were administered to a sample (N=653) of prospective University of Maryland students attending a summer orientation program during a week selected at random. The results of this study closely paralleled the original study; i.e., whites generally respond more negatively to blacks in a situation than if race were not mentioned. The results also show that the subjects did not differentiate between no reference to race and mentioning white or between blacks and Negroes in situations. (Author/DB)

ED 065520

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER

Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

CG 01 440

ED 065520

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

CHOICE OF RACIAL REFERENT AS A VARIABLE IN RACIAL ATTITUDE MEASUREMENT

Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr. and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report #5-71

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER

CHOICE OF RACIAL REFERENT AS A VARIABLE IN RACIAL ATTITUDE MEASUREMENT

Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr. and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report #5-71

SUMMARY

The difficulties of adequately measuring the attitudes of whites toward Negroes or blacks have been noted previously (Shaw & Wright, 1967). Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a,b) have summarized these as being (a) lack of contemporary content in existing measures, (b) lack of validity information, and (c) inadequate assessment techniques to measure social reinforcement for being tolerant, or positive, toward blacks.

Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a) conducted a study which demonstrated that the insertion of the word "black" into a social or personal situation caused respondents to respond differently and generally more negatively than if race were not mentioned.

The purposes of this study were (a) to provide further validity evidence for the SAS by replicating the original study on another group, (b) to determine the effect of the other racial referents on attitudes ("white" and "Negro"), and (c) to determine the effect of having subjects (*S*s) aware that race is a component in the study.

The same SAS social and personal situations and items used in Sedlacek and Brooks' (1970a,b) study were used in the current study. Four forms, neutral (A1), black (B1), white (A2) and Negro (B2) were administered to a sample (N=653) of prospective University of Maryland students attending a summer orientation program during a week selected at random.

The results of this current study closely paralleled Sedlacek and Brooks' original study; i.e., whites generally respond more negatively to blacks in a situation than if race were not mentioned. The results also show *S*s did not differentiate between no reference to race and mentioning white or between blacks and Negroes in situations. The factor structures of forms A2 and B2 combined were somewhat similar to those in Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a).

The difficulties of adequately measuring the attitudes of whites toward Negroes or blacks have been noted previously (Shaw & Wright, 1967). Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a,b) have summarized these as being (a) lack of contemporary content in existing measures, (b) lack of validity information, and (c) inadequate assessment techniques to measure social reinforcement for being tolerant, or positive, toward blacks.

Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a) demonstrated that the insertion of the word "black" into a social or personal situation caused respondents to respond differently and generally more negatively than if race were not mentioned. They attempted to avoid the measurement problems in their Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) by using contemporary situations and terminology (e.g., black), by providing validity evidence, and by using a technique which apparently relied on the fact that half of the subjects (*S*s) were unaware that racial attitudes were being measured.

The purposes of this study were (a) to provide further validity evidence for the SAS by replicating the original study on another group, (b) to determine the effect of other racial referents on attitudes ("white" and "Negro"), and (c) to determine the effect of having *S*s aware that race is a component in the study.

Method

The same SAS social and personal situations and items used in Sedlacek and Brooks' (1970a,b) study were used in the current study (see Table 1). Four forms, neutral (A1), black (B1), white (A2) and Negro (B2) were administered to a sample (N=653) of prospective University of Maryland students attending a summer orientation program during 3 days selected at random from 28 possible days. In other words, four identical questionnaires were drawn up with the

same 10 personal and social situations and 100 bipolar semantic differential scales. The only difference was that one form did not mention race (A1), and the other forms referred to black (B1), white (A2), or Negro (B2) people in each situation. The SAS was the second of a battery of three questionnaires which *Ss* completed anonymously. The SAS required 20-30 minutes to complete. The other two were demographic and attitudinal and had nothing directly to do with race.

Thirty-nine *Ss* were not included in the data analysis: 20 were completed by black students and 19 gave incomplete or unusable responses. The final usable N was 614: Form A1 (N=246), B1 (N=224), A2 (N=74) and B2 (N=70). Black students' response sheets were eliminated after the administration by noting those of the black students as they were turned in. The median scale value (Scale 0-4, Median=2) was assigned to a total of 7 questionnaires where fewer than 10 items were missing on the response sheet.

Trained white graduate and undergraduate students administered the SAS. Forms A1 and B1 were administered on two separate days and A2 and B2 on one day. Within a given administration *Ss* had an approximately equal chance of receiving either form given that day. Students were not told that different forms existed. Written instructions, similar to previous SAS administrations, were used.

The data were analyzed using analysis of variance, Duncan's Multiple Range Test and principal components factor analysis.

Results

A one-way analysis of variance (fixed model-.05 level) with Form (i.e., 4 levels) as the main effect was conducted for each of the 100 SAS items. Fifty-one SAS items (Table 2) were found significant. Using the Duncan

Multiple Range Test for group means with unequal numbers of replications (Kramer, 1954) to determine which item means were significant at the .05 level, Table 3 shows 44 significant differences occurred between forms A1 (no mention of race) and B1 (black), 43 between A1 and B2 (Negro), 38 between A2 (white) and B1, and 33 between A2 and B2. Only one significant difference occurred between forms A1 and A2, and four between B1 and B2. Sakoda, Cohen and Beall (1954) indicated that one would expect 9 tests of 100 to be significant due to chance, thus the significant differences between either A form and either B form are well above chance, while differences between the two A forms or between the two B forms were not significant. Table 4 shows means and standard deviations for the four forms.

Principal components factor analyses using squared multiple correlations as the communality estimates were conducted on forms A2 and B2 combined; factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 were rotated to a varimax solution. In the first 11 factors extracted, a factor representing eight of the ten situations, (e.g., I, II, III, V, VI, VII, IX and X) was identified for combined forms A2 and B2 (Table 5). The median communality for combined forms A2 and B2 was .66. Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a,b) have reported median communalities of .64 and .65 for forms A1 and B1. Using these as conservative reliability estimates there appears to be an acceptable amount of reliability in the forms.

Discussion

This study provides further validity evidence for the SAS. The results closely paralleled Sedlacek and Brooks' (1970a,b) earlier work; i.e., whites generally respond more negatively to blacks in a situation than if race were not mentioned. Sedlacek and Brooks' study sampled matriculated college students while the current study employed prospective college students.

If we ascribe positivity or negativity to each item pole based on general societal use, Tables 3 & 4 show that on situations III (man selling magazines) and VI (policeman) whites actually responded more positively to blacks than if race were not mentioned. These results agree with those reported by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a,b). They concluded that the two situations involved "service roles" and less intimate contact than other situations in the SAS (e.g., your best friend has just become engaged) and could be regarded by whites as "appropriate" roles for blacks. Posavac and Triandis (1968) found that social distance accounted for a large portion of variance in racial attitudes and concluded (p. 239) "Northern college male students are willing to respect Negroes as people and have Negroes as friends, but are not willing to have Negroes as neighbors or as brothers-in-law." A similar conclusion was reached by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970b, p. 979) in summarizing a hypothetical modal *s* from their study; "It is OK to have blacks sell me magazines or be policemen but they had better not move next door or get engaged to any of my friends!" While the results of the current study support these interpretations it may be that other variables are contributing to the results. For example it may be that occupational reference is important. Situations III and VI are the only two mentioning an occupation. Perhaps *S*s would respond similarly regardless of the level of the occupation presented in the situation. Thus Sedlacek and Brooks' interpretation of these results must be considered tentative pending further research.

It was felt that perhaps the word black would induce a stronger reaction in a situation because of its more militant overtones compared to the word Negro. Such was not the case as *S*s did not react differentially to blacks or Negroes. There are, of course, several possible explanations for this. It could be that the word black has become used widely enough so that it has lost its militant connotations to whites; or it could also be that for whites, any reference to a

dark-skinned person in a situation brings about similar feelings. In any case the empirical evidence from this sample indicated no attitudinal differences.

Sedlacek and Brooks made a big point of the importance of having half of the *S*s (those taking the neutral A1 form) unaware that racial attitudes were being measured. Evidence from their earlier work (1970a,b) indicated that *S*s had a strong outward set to be tolerant and ignore race in responding. The present study indicates that essentially the same attitudinal phenomena occur regardless of whether a neutral form or one that specifies white is used. Thus, it could be that since whites would tend to think of whites in a neutral situation it is not surprising. However, since there apparently was a social set to be tolerant, a more parsimonious explanation may be that despite the knowledge that maybe something racial was being measured the methodology of the study was not clear and hence it would be difficult to know exactly how to alter responses to the items. Further evidence for a tolerant racial set was the fact that all prospective students attending the orientation had participated in a 1-hr seminar on race relations for which they were required to read one of eight books on the topic. In another study, when white *S*s were asked to indicate how most college students felt about people with a number of different values, they indicated that a racist and bigot were rated most negatively. However, when similar groups of white students were administered the SAS, they responded negatively to blacks. Thus, there is evidence for a difference in what white students feel are socially acceptable attitudes toward blacks and how they actually feel themselves (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1971a).

The apparent gap between what *S*s feel are socially acceptable attitudes and their own attitudes may generate cognitive dissonance. This aspect of racial attitudes is one that merits direct exploration in future research. Also, Sedlacek and Brooks (1971b) have provided further evidence that the

contextual situations in the SAS are sufficiently difficult to ignore, so that *S*s make racial responses and are not distracted by extraneous variables such as race of the experimenter.

The factor structures of the SAS showed somewhat similar results to those reported by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a). Eight situations were found to be independent of the others; the writers are not sure why situations IV and VIII did not also show up as factors. Thus, there is evidence that the context within which one measures racial attitudes was very important. In other words, perhaps one reason why external response sets or sets cued by the questionnaire do not seem to affect results is that the situations deal with realistic social interactions that are distinguishable from one another.

Thus, the overall conclusion is that the SAS may be measuring relatively stable phenomena. That is, whites do express about the same negative attitudes toward either blacks or Negroes regardless of an external set or knowledge that racial attitudes are being measured. The results also hold for prospective and matriculating university students.

References

Kramer, C. Y. Extension of multiple range tests to group means with unequal numbers of replications. *Biometrics*, 1956, 12, 307-310.

Posavac, E. J., & Triandis, H. C. Personality characteristics, race, and grades as determinants of interpersonal attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1968, 76, 227-242.

Sakoda, J. M., Cohen, B. H., & Beall, G. Tests of significance for a series of statistical tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1954, 51, 172-175.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. The development of a measure of racial attitudes. *Experimental Publication System, American Psychological Association*, MS #177C 5 (April), 1970a. Also in *American Psychological Association Proceedings*, 1970, 5, 161-162.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Measuring racial attitudes in a situational context. *Psychological Reports*, 1970b, 27, 971-980.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Social acceptability in the measurement of racial attitudes. *Psychological Reports*, 1971a, (in press).

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Race as an experimenter effect in racial attitude measurement. *Cultural Study Center Research Report #1-71*, 1971b, University of Maryland.

Shaw, M. E., & Wright, J. M. *Scales for the measurement of attitudes.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

TABLE 1

Instructions and Situations from the Situational Attitude Scale*

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal incidents and situations. It is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous so please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Going out on a date

happy ' A ' B ' C ' D ' E ' sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., you might select B) by indicating your choice (B) on your response sheet by blackening in the appropriate space for that word scale. DO NOT MARK ON THE BOOKLET. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Sometimes you may feel as though you had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so DO NOT LOOK BACK AND FORTH through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the questionnaire. MAKE EACH ITEM A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. Respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impressions whenever possible.

SITUATIONS

	FORM A1	FORM B1
I.	A new family moves in next door to you.	A new black family moves in next door to you.
II.	You read in the paper that a man has raped a woman.	You read in the paper that a black man has raped a white woman.
III.	It is evening and a man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.	It is evening and a black man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.
IV.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young men are loitering.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five your black men are loitering.
V.	Your best friend has just become engaged.	Your best friend has just become engaged to a black person.
VI.	You are stopped for speeding by a policeman.	You are stopped for speeding by a black policeman.
VII.	A new person joins your social group.	A new black person joins your social group.
VIII.	You see a youngster steal something in a dimestore.	You see a black youngster steal something in a dimestore.
IX.	Some students on campus stage a demonstration.	Some black students on campus stage a demonstration.
X.	You get on a bus and you are the only person who has to stand.	You get on a bus that has all black people aboard and you are the only person who has to stand.

*The Situational Attitude Scale is copyrighted and available from the authors on request.

TABLE 2

Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance of SAS Items

ITEM NO.	SS (TOTAL)	SS (WITHIN)	MS (WITHIN)	SS (BETWEEN)	MS (BETWEEN)	F
1	590.22	524.36	.86	65.86	21.95	25.54*
2	528.89	522.20	.86	6.69	2.23	2.61*
3	713.70	652.85	1.07	60.85	20.28	18.95*
4	466.59	463.42	.76	3.17	1.06	1.39
5	882.49	857.19	1.41	25.30	8.43	6.00*
6	802.93	775.50	1.27	27.43	9.14	7.19*
7	522.40	478.43	.78	43.97	14.66	18.69*
8	725.43	701.06	1.15	24.37	8.12	7.07*
9	614.75	564.08	.93	50.67	16.89	18.27*
10	645.72	641.58	1.05	4.14	1.38	1.31
11	303.26	302.99	.50	.27	.09	.18
12	337.49	336.87	.55	.62	.21	.38
13	317.62	316.14	.52	1.48	.49	.95
14	461.69	460.22	.75	1.47	.49	.65
15	935.78	932.88	1.53	2.90	.97	.63
16	721.34	720.78	1.18	.56	.19	.16
17	574.71	574.07	.94	.64	.21	.23
18	828.48	826.33	1.36	2.15	.72	.53
19	828.18	820.93	1.35	7.25	2.42	1.80
20	830.23	816.79	1.34	13.44	4.48	3.35*
21	886.87	882.89	1.45	3.98	1.33	.92
22	772.54	737.96	1.21	34.58	11.53	9.53*
23	751.36	720.06	1.18	31.30	10.43	8.84*
24	211.31	205.40	.34	5.91	1.97	5.86*
25	406.39	392.64	.64	13.75	4.58	7.12*
26	1180.02	1133.99	1.86	46.03	15.34	8.25*
27	727.30	695.34	1.14	31.96	10.66	9.35*
28	774.36	769.88	1.26	4.48	1.49	1.18
29	377.78	351.70	.58	26.08	8.69	15.08*
30	735.21	721.61	1.18	13.60	4.53	3.83*
31	670.72	667.70	1.10	3.02	1.01	.92
32	227.38	226.94	.37	.44	.15	.39
33	428.29	425.87	.70	2.42	.81	1.15
34	309.49	303.84	.50	5.65	1.88	3.78*
35	477.97	440.58	.72	37.39	12.46	17.26*
36	642.83	641.35	1.05	1.48	.49	.47
37	621.66	617.97	1.01	3.69	1.23	1.21
38	599.87	592.92	.97	6.95	2.32	2.38
39	738.12	722.58	1.19	15.54	5.18	4.37*
40	726.93	717.28	1.18	9.65	3.22	2.74*
41	919.13	871.13	1.43	48.00	16.00	11.20*
42	1116.48	762.01	1.25	354.47	118.16	94.59*
43	778.14	657.55	1.08	120.59	40.20	37.29*
44	680.76	512.31	.84	168.45	56.15	66.86*

TABLE 2

Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance of SAS Items
(Continued)

ITEM NO.	SS (TOTAL)	SS (WITHIN)	MS (WITHIN)	SS (BETWEEN)	MS (BETWEEN)	F
45	708.58	488.62	.80	219.96	73.32	91.53*
46	706.69	659.52	1.08	47.17	15.73	14.54*
47	766.29	656.55	1.08	109.74	36.58	33.99*
48	681.95	568.22	.93	113.73	37.91	40.70*
49	930.51	820.48	1.35	110.03	36.68	27.27*
50	886.20	614.84	1.01	271.36	90.45	89.74*
51	1176.22	1098.49	1.80	77.73	25.91	14.39*
52	882.34	762.53	1.25	119.81	39.94	31.95*
53	1289.71	1094.48	1.79	195.23	65.08	36.27*
54	682.12	661.57	1.09	20.55	6.85	6.32*
55	674.02	650.11	1.07	23.91	7.97	7.48*
56	795.31	763.48	1.25	31.83	10.61	8.48*
57	409.03	407.53	.67	1.50	.50	.75
58	528.37	515.43	.85	12.94	4.31	5.10*
59	415.35	413.15	.68	2.20	.73	1.08
60	322.41	319.19	.52	3.22	1.07	2.05
61	479.21	474.56	.78	4.65	1.55	1.99
62	475.70	461.10	.76	14.60	4.87	6.44*
63	169.15	162.74	.27	6.41	2.14	8.01*
64	605.66	600.08	.98	5.58	1.86	1.89
65	520.99	502.56	.82	18.43	6.14	7.46*
66	695.39	688.55	1.13	6.84	2.28	2.02
67	598.84	590.27	.97	8.57	2.86	2.95*
68	323.52	312.51	.51	11.01	3.67	7.16*
69	546.91	541.02	.89	5.89	1.96	2.21
70	684.08	683.23	1.12	.85	.28	.25
71	1066.82	1055.12	1.73	11.70	3.90	2.25
72	463.33	457.81	.75	5.52	1.84	2.45
73	755.88	752.76	1.23	3.12	1.04	.84
74	872.14	869.16	1.43	2.98	.99	.70
75	808.83	800.32	1.31	8.51	2.84	2.16
76	958.40	955.43	1.57	2.97	.99	.63
77	741.72	740.88	1.22	.84	.28	.23
78	845.83	839.89	1.38	5.94	1.98	1.44
79	692.84	690.00	1.13	2.84	.95	.84
80	728.60	725.08	1.19	3.52	1.17	.99
81	753.33	744.40	1.22	8.93	2.98	2.44
82	745.14	743.26	1.22	1.88	.63	.51
83	547.73	542.89	.89	4.84	1.61	1.81
84	713.74	708.76	1.16	4.98	1.66	1.43
85	822.48	794.47	1.30	28.01	9.34	7.17*
86	532.94	527.30	.86	5.64	1.88	2.17
87	702.93	685.84	1.12	17.09	5.70	5.07*
88	302.33	298.17	.49	4.16	1.39	2.84*

TABLE 2

Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance of SAS Items
(Continued)

ITEM NO.	SS (TOTAL)	SS (WITHIN)	MS (WITHIN)	SS (BETWEEN)	MS (BETWEEN)	F
89	597.98	593.96	.97	4.02	1.34	1.38
90	584.53	547.47	.90	37.06	12.35	13.77*
91	877.53	833.00	1.37	44.53	14.84	10.87*
92	728.08	722.83	1.19	5.25	1.75	1.48
93	641.55	639.39	1.05	2.16	.72	.69
94	700.89	683.36	1.12	17.53	5.84	5.22*
95	964.55	925.28	1.52	39.27	13.09	8.63*
96	1023.05	988.98	1.62	34.07	11.36	7.01*
97	643.43	637.88	1.05	5.55	1.85	1.77
98	961.49	950.86	1.56	10.63	3.54	2.27
99	769.84	267.81	.44	2.03	.68	1.54
100	730.33	727.31	1.19	3.02	1.01	.85

* Significant beyond the .05 level.

Note: df = 610 (MS Within) & 3 (MS Between)

TABLE 3

Summary of Post Hoc Analyses Using Duncan Multiple Range Test
for Group Means with Unequal Replications for Forms A1, B1, A2 and B2*

ITEM NO.	MEAN COMPARISON LOWEST		HIGHEST		ITEM NO.	MEAN COMPARISON LOWEST		HIGHEST	
1	A2	A1	B1	B2	29	B1	B2	A1	A2
2	A1	A2	B1	B2	30	B2	A2	B1	A1
3	B2	B1	A2	A1	34	A2	A1	B2	B1
5	A1	A2	B1	B2	35	B2	B1	A1	A2
6	B1	B2	A1	A2	39	B1	B2	A1	A2
7	A2	A1	B1	B2	40	A2	A1	B2	B1
8	B2	B1	A1	A2	41	A1	B1	A2	B2
9	A2	A1	B1	B2	42	A2	A1	B1	B2
20	A1	A2	B1	B2	43	A2	A1	B1	B2
22	B1	B2	A1	A2	44	A1	A2	B1	B2
23	B1	B2	A2	A1	45	B2	B1	A1	A2
24	B1	B2	A2	A1	46	A2	A1	B2	B1
25	B1	B2	A2	A1	47	A2	A1	B1	B2
26	B1	B2	A1	A2	48	A1	A2	B1	B2
27	B1	B2	A2	A1	49	A2	A1	B1	B2

* 48 items significant at p <.05

TABLE 3

Summary of Post Hoc Analyses Using Duncan Multiple Range Test
for Group Means with Unequal Replications for Forms A1, B1, A2 and B2*
(Continued)

ITEM NO.	MEAN COMPARISON LOWEST		HIGHEST		ITEM NO.	MEAN COMPARISON LOWEST		HIGHEST	
50	B2	B1	A2	A1	63	A1	A2	B2	B1
51	B2	B1	A1	A2	85	B2	B1	A1	A2
52	B2	B1	A2	A1	87	B2	B1	A1	A2
53	A1	A2	B1	B2	88	B2	B1	A1	A2
54	B2	B1	A1	A2	90	A2	A1	B2	B1
55	B1	B2	A1	A2	91	A2	A1	B1	B2
56	A2	A1	B2	B1	94	B1	B2	A2	A1
58	B1	B2	A2	A1	95	B2	B1	A1	A2
62	B2	B1	A1	A2	96	A1	A2	B2	B1

* 48 items significant at $p < .05$

NOTE: Any two means not underscored by the same line (e.g., $\cdots R_4$, $- - - R_3$, $\text{——} R_2$) are significantly different at the .05 level.

TABLE 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Forms A1, B1, A2 and B2*

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A1 (N=246) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B1 (N=224) MEAN	S.D.	FORM A2 (N=74) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B2 (N=70) MEAN	S.D.
	I. NEW FAMILY NEXT DOOR								
1	good-bad	1.06	.83	1.66	.95	.91	.88	1.71	1.19
2	safe-unsafe	.97	.86	1.19	.97	1.11	.87	1.20	1.04
3	angry-not angry	3.54	.85	2.92	1.20	3.53	.88	2.87	1.19
4	friendly-unfriendly	.82	.82	.92	.90	.80	.86	1.01	.97
5	sympathetic-not sympathetic	1.50	1.08	1.90	1.27	1.69	1.18	2.00	1.26
6	nervous-calm	3.00	1.10	2.57	1.17	3.07	1.03	2.73	1.18
7	happy-sad	1.32	.82	1.79	.93	1.20	.91	1.91	.93
8	objectionable-acceptable	3.24	.86	2.88	1.21	3.24	1.00	2.74	1.32
9	desirable-undesirable	1.37	.84	1.81	1.05	1.19	.98	2.07	1.05
10	suspicious-trusting	2.70	.98	2.62	1.06	2.74	.97	2.46	1.11
	II. MAN RAPED WOMAN								
11	affection-disgust	3.57	.75	3.59	.66	3.64	.69	3.56	.69
12	relish-repulsion	3.51	.80	3.48	.70	3.58	.70	3.49	.72
13	happy-sad	3.50	.78	3.61	.67	3.55	.67	3.57	.69
14	friendly-hostile	3.15	.89	3.11	.86	3.07	.80	3.00	.92
15	uninvolved-involved	1.81	1.30	1.87	1.19	1.85	1.33	2.04	1.04
16	hope-hopelessness	2.13	1.08	2.09	1.09	2.18	1.12	2.17	1.08
17	aloof-outraged	2.52	1.01	2.55	.94	2.50	.94	2.61	.97
18	injure-kill	1.48	1.17	1.50	1.12	1.35	1.21	1.36	1.25
19	safe-fearful	2.22	1.24	2.46	1.06	2.39	1.17	2.36	1.16
20	empathetic-can't understand	2.29	1.18	2.60	1.13	2.39	1.23	2.61	1.09
	III. MAN SELLING MAGAZINES								
21	relaxed-startled	2.00	1.20	1.94	1.26	2.19	.99	2.10	1.25
22	receptive-cautious	3.02	1.04	2.53	1.20	3.05	.86	2.67	1.21
23	excited-unexcited	3.00	1.06	2.50	1.11	2.82	1.12	2.63	1.05
24	glad-angered	2.33	.58	2.12	.58	2.27	.56	2.13	.61
25	pleased-annoyed	2.75	.81	2.42	.79	2.68	.83	2.50	.79
26	indifferent-suspicious	2.34	1.33	1.81	1.45	2.47	1.19	1.91	1.38
27	tolerable-intolerable	1.70	1.07	1.21	1.08	1.68	1.00	1.36	1.10
28	afraid-secure	2.25	1.14	2.15	1.12	2.04	1.10	2.01	1.10
29	friend-enemy	2.05	.76	1.63	.79	2.08	.68	1.74	.74
30	unprotected-protected	2.43	1.07	2.34	1.11	2.12	1.02	1.99	1.15

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
** See Table 1 for complete situation.

TABLE 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Forms A1, B1, A2 and B2*

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A1 (N=246) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B1 (N=224) MEAN	S.D.	FORM A2 (N=74) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B2 (N=70) MEAN	S.D.
	IV. CORNER OF LOITERING MEN								
31	relaxed-tensed	2.92	1.11	3.07	.94	2.92	1.07	2.99	1.11
32	pleased-angered	2.26	.59	2.28	.58	2.30	.68	2.34	.70
33	superior-inferior	2.00	.95	2.12	.69	1.97	.98	1.97	.64
34	smarter-dumber	1.44	.74	1.63	.63	1.37	.80	1.49	.72
35	whiter-blacker	1.61	.73	1.13	.98	1.68	.70	1.13	.95
36	aggressive-passive	2.55	1.08	2.66	.96	2.65	1.08	2.57	.97
37	safe-unsafe	2.64	1.02	2.78	.95	2.58	1.07	2.76	1.08
38	friendly-unfriendly	2.31	.99	2.11	1.01	2.37	.93	2.33	.96
39	excited-unexcited	2.07	1.09	1.78	1.05	2.18	1.20	1.80	1.07
40	trivial-important	1.75	1.11	1.98	1.06	1.64	1.14	1.76	1.03
	V. FRIEND BECOMES ENGAGED								
41	aggressive-passive	1.60	1.18	2.09	1.14	2.23	1.36	2.27	1.24
42	happy-sad	.61	.91	2.01	1.36	.37	.63	2.23	1.31
43	tolerable-intolerable	.52	.78	1.35	1.24	.34	.69	1.40	1.38
44	complimented-insulted	.93	.89	1.93	.91	.95	1.01	2.13	.95
45	angered-overjoyed	3.20	.81	2.01	.95	3.16	.84	1.94	1.03
46	secure-fearful	1.03	.98	1.59	1.08	.97	.98	1.53	1.18
47	hopeful-hopeless	.64	.83	1.44	1.20	.61	.90	1.59	1.26
48	excited-unexcited	.72	.82	1.54	1.07	.77	.87	1.73	1.15
49	right-wrong	.96	.97	1.74	1.34	.80	.97	1.83	1.32
50	disgusting-pleasing	3.37	.88	2.08	1.13	3.37	.79	1.93	1.17
	VI. STOPPED BY POLICEMAN								
51	calm-nervous	3.07	1.16	2.55	1.47	3.10	1.16	2.04	1.65
52	trusting-suspicious	1.84	1.23	.97	1.04	1.64	1.15	.79	.90
53	afraid-safe	1.48	1.29	2.60	1.38	1.85	1.33	2.87	1.38
54	friendly-unfriendly	1.26	1.08	.93	1.03	1.35	.99	.87	.99
55	tolerant-intolerant	1.07	1.14	.68	.90	1.10	1.16	.69	.89
56	bitter-pleasant	2.34	1.15	2.79	1.09	2.22	1.09	2.60	1.15
57	cooperative-uncooperative	.48	.85	.38	.75	.49	.90	.43	.81
58	acceptive-belligerent	.88	.96	.57	.84	.88	.96	.69	.94
59	inferior-superior	1.75	.87	1.80	.71	1.61	1.02	1.79	.76
60	smarter-dumber	1.96	.80	2.00	.61	1.80	.84	2.07	.62

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
** See Table 1 for complete situation.

TABLE 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Forms A1, B1, A2 and B2*

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A1 (N=246) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B1 (N=224) MEAN	S.D.	FORM A2 (N=74) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B2 (N=70) MEAN	S.D.
	VII. PERSON JOINS SOCIAL GROUP								
61	warm-cold	.97	.86	1.00	.90	.74	.76	1.07	1.01
62	sad-happy	2.90	.82	2.74	.89	3.12	.81	2.56	1.07
63	superior-inferior	1.70	.63	1.93	.38	1.76	.49	1.79	.48
64	threatened-neutral	3.20	1.07	3.41	.91	3.30	1.02	3.34	.92
65	pleased-displeased	1.04	.83	1.27	.95	.89	.82	1.47	1.11
66	understanding-indifferent	.99	.95	1.05	1.11	1.10	1.11	1.34	1.23
67	suspicious-trusting	2.69	.95	2.96	.96	2.76	1.03	2.86	1.13
68	disappointed-elated	2.46	.69	2.37	.72	2.51	.75	2.04	.75
69	favorable-unfavorable	1.06	.89	1.12	.97	1.00	.88	1.36	1.06
70	uncomfortable-comfortable	2.74	1.06	2.78	1.07	2.87	.98	2.76	1.11
	VIII. YOUNGSTER STEALS								
71	surprising-not surprising	2.62	1.41	2.72	1.18	2.73	1.34	2.27	1.34
72	sad-happy	.92	.89	.72	.85	.76	.79	.74	.91
73	disinterested-interested	2.70	1.13	2.59	1.14	2.72	1.01	2.80	1.07
74	close-distant	2.07	1.16	2.09	1.23	2.04	1.29	2.29	1.12
75	understandable-baffling	1.65	1.14	1.50	1.17	1.87	1.14	1.53	1.09
76	responsible-not responsible	2.29	1.24	2.22	1.27	2.43	1.22	2.37	1.29
77	concerned-unconcerned	1.20	1.14	1.13	1.10	1.20	.99	1.10	1.11
78	sympathy-indifference	1.60	1.14	1.50	1.24	1.73	1.16	1.37	1.09
79	expected-unexpected	1.89	1.13	1.73	.99	1.84	.99	1.80	1.12
80	hopeful-hopeless	1.59	1.06	1.68	1.12	1.55	1.05	1.81	1.15
	IX. CAMPUS DEMONSTRATION								
81	bad-good	1.97	1.04	1.85	1.14	2.04	1.09	1.61	1.23
82	understanding-indifferent	1.52	1.06	1.48	1.10	1.57	1.07	1.66	1.28
83	suspicious-trusting	1.69	.92	1.80	.94	1.85	.95	1.56	1.04
84	safe-unsafe	2.02	1.05	2.18	1.07	2.01	1.07	2.23	1.23
85	disturbed-undisturbed	1.70	1.18	1.48	1.13	1.68	1.10	1.01	1.07
86	justified-unjustified	1.80	.84	1.61	1.00	1.70	.93	1.86	1.00
87	tense-calm	1.84	1.12	1.58	1.00	1.99	1.00	1.49	1.09
88	hate-love	2.08	.62	2.01	.76	2.22	.65	1.90	.80
89	wrong-right	2.03	.92	2.00	1.07	2.04	.99	1.77	.97
90	humorous-serious	2.83	1.08	3.29	.83	2.68	.88	3.26	.88

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
** See Table 1 for complete situation.

TABLE 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Forms A1, B1, A2 and B2*

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A1 (N=246) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B1 (N=224) MEAN	S.D.	FORM A2 (N=74) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B2 (N=70) MEAN	S.D.
	X. ONLY PERSON STANDING								
91	fearful-secure	2.44	1.16	1.89	1.17	2.55	1.14	2.19	1.22
92	tolerable-intolerable	1.00	1.11	1.18	1.03	1.19	1.18	1.01	1.10
93	hostile-indifferent	2.89	1.08	2.82	.96	2.92	1.00	3.01	1.03
94	important-trivial	3.08	1.02	2.70	1.09	2.99	1.00	2.91	1.15
95	conspicuous-inconspicuous	1.53	1.29	1.15	1.16	1.80	1.26	1.03	1.23
96	calm-anxious	1.56	1.32	2.05	1.22	1.57	1.23	1.96	1.32
97	indignant-understanding	2.80	1.08	2.60	.95	2.62	1.06	2.60	1.03
98	comfortable-uncomfortable	2.44	1.30	2.65	1.17	2.26	1.27	2.47	1.28
99	hate-love	2.07	.69	2.18	.59	2.18	.75	2.06	.68
100	not resentful-resentful	1.08	1.14	1.04	.97	1.16	1.27	.89	1.10

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)

** See Table 1 for complete situation.

TABLE 5

Principal Components Factor Loadings of SAS Forms A2 and B2
Combined, Rotated to Varimax Solution (N=144)*

ITEM NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	XIX	XX	XXI	XXII	h^2**
1	57	15	04	-01	-01	-11	12	-04	49	01	-21	03	-02	-01	06	12	-01	03	13	11	-02	-18	74
2	22	16	13	-02	03	-18	00	02	55	-02	-29	05	-11	-01	-02	02	04	-17	13	07	14	-12	59
3	-34	08	-03	08	-05	-11	-10	13	-58	-20	09	-14	-04	-04	-05	-08	05	-07	06	12	02	-05	61
4	26	-01	14	02	-12	-07	04	-08	40	08	-24	19	06	-11	-11	19	-11	01	10	23	-22	-06	55
5	27	-06	12	-03	05	16	12	06	07	-04	03	-05	-06	06	14	03	-01	03	-04	62	-18	-07	59
6	-10	-11	-05	11	-02	-16	-13	03	-65	-14	08	13	15	02	-06	13	-00	-10	-03	15	14	-12	65
7	52	09	02	-08	01	-05	-04	04	53	-02	-02	-13	07	05	-10	-10	01	23	11	26	15	04	79
8	-27	12	04	13	-00	-01	-07	05	-71	-14	06	-05	03	07	-10	-05	-08	-15	18	-08	-07	-07	74
9	55	11	01	-13	-08	01	-03	12	57	-02	-10	01	00	01	-09	04	02	12	11	24	06	01	80
10	-34	-05	-21	12	03	-03	-28	04	-47	-06	37	-01	06	-15	-02	-08	21	03	-08	01	-21	-07	76
11	-06	-01	-10	-19	65	-22	17	-01	-13	10	29	-10	07	22	02	-08	28	06	05	08	05	18	84
12	-10	-12	-14	-11	60	-19	17	04	-18	02	-24	-08	10	26	09	-08	26	11	06	12	-01	16	79
13	-05	07	02	-15	71	-06	08	10	-06	-02	10	05	15	17	03	-09	06	-05	06	01	-08	00	64
14	06	-14	14	04	58	-15	16	16	01	-02	-05	21	10	-15	-08	02	-17	-00	07	-09	-06	06	59
15	15	-03	-01	05	49	14	06	-00	07	03	19	-02	02	-01	02	10	06	-20	04	-05	15	-18	45
16	15	20	15	-16	22	05	12	22	01	09	-26	27	-07	-01	-19	-13	-13	14	-04	16	00	19	51
17	17	01	02	07	65	08	08	-13	06	18	13	05	02	-14	10	-05	-11	00	-19	07	04	-02	62
18	16	-08	21	-09	14	-07	-03	-17	11	05	-09	13	01	-10	07	-06	05	05	-06	-10	55	-06	52
19	01	08	11	-10	53	30	32	02	10	05	-01	-05	-21	-02	02	18	-07	04	12	-06	15	02	64
20	08	11	-06	-06	62	08	-09	-19	08	-10	-19	-20	-04	-18	-24	03	-08	-01	-05	-04	-04	-13	68
21	00	21	-05	-05	-06	-04	62	-14	16	16	-03	14	-15	14	-21	-13	-01	-13	10	07	05	27	73
22	-03	15	-05	-01	06	-05	70	05	04	05	04	14	-00	08	04	00	09	01	07	07	03	04	56
23	-05	-08	-11	04	-02	04	-18	70	-13	-02	06	05	05	17	-07	02	03	09	01	06	-06	-03	62
24	12	-24	01	-06	-09	-06	45	01	12	12	-03	12	15	-06	-20	-25	12	12	-24	10	-03	-11	55
25	03	-15	09	-12	05	-09	71	08	-10	15	03	-00	11	-08	-19	-12	01	15	04	05	08	02	67
26	-05	07	01	-01	03	03	71	-11	04	17	-04	13	06	01	06	-12	-13	06	06	09	-00	-06	63
27	04	-17	-02	-22	13	-01	55	-14	00	21	-03	01	-12	-11	-06	-25	-07	-02	-26	05	-10	-10	64
28	01	-10	-15	03	-16	-11	-71	24	-04	-05	02	02	09	02	-02	-10	06	01	-07	15	11	-01	70
29	-02	09	-02	-15	07	-00	43	-05	11	18	-22	31	-04	-19	-25	-19	04	-08	-21	27	07	-02	66
30	04	-19	-09	12	-07	-01	-51	04	-14	-13	-06	21	17	-00	-11	-30	07	-04	05	17	11	-11	60
31	-01	30	01	-06	23	06	51	30	-01	10	-11	04	10	-14	13	17	-04	-08	19	-01	04	11	65
32	10	14	05	-19	19	01	50	23	-01	-10	-10	05	37	-10	02	-03	04	17	-11	05	07	-04	61
33	-00	01	-10	-06	09	74	10	02	01	-10	-00	-04	05	08	-04	-09	-09	01	08	03	-03	-01	63
34	01	-02	07	07	-11	65	-20	-01	02	-06	00	-01	-05	-08	05	03	16	-25	22	07	11	06	65

* 10 largest loadings on each factor are underlined and decimal points are omitted for ease of reading.
** Communality

TABLE 5

Principal Components Factor Loadings of SAS Forms A2 and B2
Combined, Rotated to Varimax Solution (N=144)*
(Continued)

ITEM NO.	FACTOR I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	XIX	XX	XXI	XXII	h^{2}**
35	-35	-20	13	02	-24	38	-19	-03	11	-03	07	05	03	08	01	-05	26	-15	-09	15	09	-05	58
36	-12	11	-09	-03	08	15	-05	16	04	-09	11	-01	11	65	-15	15	05	17	05	-04	-06	-15	66
37	-01	27	-08	-16	23	03	52	32	21	-01	-09	05	04	-27	08	03	16	-10	16	-03	-13	-03	77
38	10	13	08	-14	19	-13	40	38	10	11	-14	16	-01	-28	-06	-04	-03	12	03	-07	-37	-06	72
39	-12	-20	-02	14	-08	19	-25	06	-03	06	13	14	-18	51	05	-12	-02	-14	-14	21	-17	07	66
40	05	26	10	-16	13	-28	40	-06	00	-01	-16	-15	05	-19	13	-00	21	08	04	-29	-10	-04	63
41	-14	07	-07	05	02	03	05	06	-10	02	00	-03	13	10	-69	13	01	07	10	-09	-12	-06	60
42	88	12	-10	-09	10	02	01	-05	13	04	-05	06	-01	-02	02	08	-01	04	00	-06	-03	00	85
43	79	-06	-03	-09	15	-01	03	-02	15	05	-03	-02	-13	-09	05	-01	-09	03	-13	01	03	-02	74
44	73	24	-02	-00	-02	07	-01	05	01	01	-07	01	05	-11	07	16	-04	04	-03	09	16	12	70
45	-85	-10	04	15	03	-07	02	00	-02	-09	13	-15	-02	-05	-07	-02	02	-00	05	-08	01	-07	84
46	53	17	09	-06	06	15	08	-05	27	16	-10	31	-26	-16	13	-02	20	-01	06	05	-05	11	72
47	79	-08	09	-16	-06	-04	-01	09	06	10	-07	13	-11	-07	-07	05	-07	02	-05	05	00	10	76
48	67	08	06	-05	-08	-17	-19	-04	-00	11	04	-05	-13	-12	-17	00	03	-01	-11	-02	-13	-02	64
49	77	-04	02	-15	05	-08	02	-01	13	13	-09	-04	-01	10	12	05	16	-09	-01	-05	-01	-11	74
50	-87	-03	-01	10	-09	-04	-05	04	-12	-04	13	-05	-05	-05	-07	-11	04	03	-03	03	03	01	85
51	-17	-03	10	07	-03	14	12	04	-14	01	-10	02	-07	-00	04	-65	-02	00	10	04	07	01	53
52	-16	-01	49	-02	-01	03	05	-05	16	10	-18	-09	03	-06	06	-53	11	-02	-12	-06	-00	-06	67
53	19	03	-33	08	-08	09	-04	05	-04	-04	-07	-07	-09	05	-10	67	06	-03	-06	07	-03	07	67
54	-01	-07	48	22	02	-03	14	-02	-00	03	-17	-08	-11	03	-19	-18	23	-02	03	-00	06	-05	49
55	08	06	73	07	03	03	-07	01	16	17	03	04	04	-04	07	-15	06	-04	-23	06	-03	-14	72
56	05	-04	-70	-07	07	05	-11	-02	10	-15	04	01	01	05	03	12	02	-09	-09	02	-01	04	58
57	10	-10	51	03	12	11	-14	-04	16	19	-13	-04	-07	04	01	-06	-03	-14	-22	04	10	22	52
58	07	09	70	02	01	-05	07	-08	02	19	-12	05	-06	-05	12	04	-10	04	07	09	12	11	64
59	29	-10	-00	18	-09	-16	-13	-04	-00	-10	-08	-05	-02	-10	06	24	08	-10	-54	-05	06	-01	60
60	-04	09	-07	-17	-02	20	19	10	18	-01	-08	-03	11	-09	-18	-05	09	-06	52	01	-06	01	51
61	50	-07	11	-03	-06	-12	-00	-06	16	11	-50	-13	-03	-12	-11	-16	-29	17	03	12	-12	-11	81
62	-54	02	-11	03	-09	-04	02	-01	-15	-02	62	15	-01	-01	12	01	05	-08	08	-09	-00	-03	78
63	-02	04	13	36	01	05	-07	08	04	10	28	-02	11	02	-11	04	51	-11	18	-05	-11	11	59
64	-03	10	-15	14	-07	04	-03	-07	-10	-17	48	-08	-07	22	-31	-01	09	-06	-03	04	12	-10	52
65	62	12	09	-13	10	03	07	-01	19	-02	-55	-05	02	-08	-01	-09	03	03	-05	06	06	-03	81
66	36	02	03	-02	-06	-04	01	10	09	10	-39	02	-31	-08	-05	05	04	09	-04	40	11	-12	61
67	-23	-04	-15	24	08	04	-02	12	-21	-20	58	-22	05	01	-02	07	12	-04	10	04	-10	19	69

* 10 largest loadings on each factor are underlined and decimal points are omitted for ease of reading.
** Communality

TABLE 5

Principal Components Factor Loadings of SAS Forms A2 and B2
Combined, Rotated to Varimax Solution (N=144)*
(Continued)

ITEM NO.	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	XIX	XX	XXI	XXII	h^{2}**
68	-54	-02	-07	14	-03	-02	-04	07	-01	-01	56	-01	06	-02	11	-13	-06	-01	09	-03	-16	-05	71
69	56	-01	01	-08	04	06	10	03	15	17	-61	12	10	-04	04	-04	08	04	-04	07	05	-05	80
70	-28	-17	-09	06	05	-00	-02	-03	-15	-17	63	-03	11	05	-01	12	-02	-15	-10	19	07	-07	67
71	04	-16	-01	-01	01	-05	15	16	07	-00	-07	62	-11	05	01	-04	01	10	02	06	-01	-01	50
72	16	-01	05	00	-11	01	-02	-07	08	01	-03	05	-66	-03	11	03	-03	02	-12	08	09	-05	54
73	-12	07	-15	20	10	-04	08	-08	-11	-11	26	-17	41	-12	-00	05	-02	-52	17	03	22	04	78
74	04	10	07	-13	04	-10	06	00	05	-12	-17	-08	01	-05	10	-00	-02	66	13	06	-09	10	58
75	-11	-12	19	-04	09	-20	12	-11	19	01	06	-51	-14	14	-04	-14	-18	10	01	22	-11	06	60
76	02	21	-10	-05	-08	-09	08	07	14	08	01	04	04	09	01	01	-03	50	-11	-02	16	-02	40
77	15	-01	11	-14	-15	-12	08	20	14	19	-14	08	-33	-01	-19	01	-10	37	-35	08	-14	-10	67
78	-01	-01	26	-14	-04	-08	04	24	07	11	-13	-10	-24	04	-07	-06	-20	05	-45	22	-03	-17	57
79	-15	-07	-07	-12	-01	07	-25	18	-04	-10	-05	-72	02	-06	-04	06	12	08	-01	03	-08	-00	71
80	21	13	17	-21	02	-07	22	20	14	11	-01	-05	-03	-27	-32	-00	07	04	-01	04	04	20	46
81	-21	-15	16	76	-08	01	-18	-13	-08	07	-04	09	03	-04	-00	10	04	02	05	09	-05	-05	75
82	21	02	10	-65	-02	-13	10	11	03	-06	-14	-05	-11	07	-02	03	08	17	11	-04	09	-24	67
83	-18	-22	02	62	-18	01	-19	-07	06	11	14	-03	-01	-04	12	00	12	-19	02	21	-13	-17	73
84	06	24	-01	-56	09	-05	05	-15	15	-22	-02	03	-03	-20	02	-04	11	04	-14	-18	-10	17	63
85	-14	-21	15	61	-03	-09	-03	06	-06	13	02	11	-29	03	-10	-06	10	07	02	-10	03	-33	74
86	11	-04	-08	-76	04	01	-04	-11	02	08	-16	01	-08	-07	-04	02	13	16	05	14	-11	-04	75
87	-07	-14	01	30	04	-01	-09	04	-11	04	-05	03	-11	13	-08	-13	-09	-10	-12	15	11	-65	67
88	-39	07	-03	60	-03	03	-20	10	-10	-09	07	-03	-09	08	07	-05	12	-13	-12	-19	-17	11	71
89	-12	08	05	77	00	-12	-10	-05	-13	-03	06	-01	-02	-06	-10	-02	15	10	-11	-05	04	14	74
90	08	19	-13	-02	08	12	04	-12	02	-06	01	-09	31	10	-09	13	21	11	01	09	-47	10	53
91	-22	-48	-05	-07	-10	-05	-13	08	-21	-41	06	01	20	-08	05	03	14	01	01	-01	05	-12	63
92	11	02	14	19	01	03	18	22	23	62	-13	-13	-09	02	03	-01	-05	-09	-15	02	02	-01	66
93	-12	-08	-20	-04	-11	10	-12	12	-03	-68	11	-11	-02	-05	-08	-01	08	06	03	00	05	-01	62
94	-17	-05	-07	06	-01	11	-08	00	03	-70	12	06	28	-00	-00	03	-18	03	-01	15	10	01	68
95	-20	-65	01	12	03	-04	-16	01	05	-11	05	04	-05	07	06	-05	-01	-08	-04	-01	09	-01	56
96	10	56	14	-09	-01	-01	33	-04	15	40	-00	-02	12	05	-00	07	01	08	05	-12	-10	04	70
97	-06	-13	-07	-06	06	-05	-17	01	-03	-68	05	-01	-15	02	03	-02	04	01	-05	-06	-13	-01	58
98	10	62	04	-15	-04	-13	16	03	08	33	03	01	02	08	-08	-02	06	33	12	-06	01	08	73
99	-18	-36	-18	26	-14	16	-11	06	01	-46	19	-10	-03	14	19	03	-05	-13	-02	-13	-05	04	67
100	06	09	22	07	04	-06	10	05	13	74	01	12	-03	-13	-06	-10	07	14	-03	03	03	-04	71

* 10 largest loadings on each factor are underlined and decimal points are omitted for ease of reading.
** Communality